Leprosy eradication

†1430. SHRI MOTILAL VORA:
SHRI SATYAVRAT CHATURVEDI:

Will the Minister of HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE be pleased to state:

(a) the funds allocated for eradication of leprosy by Government during 2006-07, and the amount spent by the States, State-wise;

(b) the names of the States which have not achieved the target of eradication of leprosy so far; and

(c) the steps Government are taking to motivate the States which have not achieved the said target to take necessary steps in this direction at the earliest?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE (SHRIMATI PANABAKA LAKSHMI): (a) State-wise funds allocated by Union Government and utilized by States/UTs during 2006-07 are given in the Statement (*See* below).

(b) The goal of National Health Policy 2002, was elimination of leprosy as a public health problem (*i.e.* prevelance rate of <1 case/10,000 population) at national level which has already been achieved in December, 2005.

As of June, 2007, 28 States/UTs have achieved leprosy elimination status, whereas 7 States/UTs are yet to achieve elimination. These are Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, West Bengal, Delhi, Chandigarh and D & N Haveli.

(c) Government of India has decided to implement Block Leprosy Awareness Campaigns in high priority districts and blocks with prevelance rate of >2/10,000 population during the month of September to November, 2007. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare has also issued letters to State Governments to accelerate the pace of implementation of leprosy services as per the approved action plan.

Statement

National Leprosy Eradication Programme
Financial Progress of States during 2006-07

(Rs, in lakhs)

Sl.	States/UTs	Allocated funds			Unspent fund reported by State as on 31.03.2007	Expenditure reported by State during 2006-07 (5-6)	% of funds Utilization over allocated funds (7/5*100)
		Opening Balance as on 01.04.06	Release made during 2006-07	Total funds allocated during 2006-07 (3+4)			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	Andhra Pradesh	56.26	138.86	195.12	70.62	124.5	63.81
2	Arunachal Pradesh	12.77	51.9	64.67	0.45	64.22	99.30
3	Assam	29.52	71.28	100.8	33.29	67.51	66.97
4	Bihar	250.6	0	250.6	213.79	36.81	14.69

†Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
5	Chhattisgarh	21.32	110.01	131.33	30	101.33	77.16
6	Goa	1.73	2.83	4.56	0.2	4.36	95.61
7	Gujarat	41.21	87.54	128.75	24.32	104.43	81.11
8	Haryana	29.79	47.66	77.45	42.15	35.3	45.58
9	Himachal Pradesh	16.12	60.69	76.81	32.93	43.88	57.13
10	(Jammu Div.)	8.93	18.74	27.67	6.58	21.09	76.22
11	(Kashmir Div.)	9.66	13.52	23.18	13.29	9.89	42.67
12	Jharkhand	80.59	47.07	127.66	62.89	64.77	50.74
13	Karnataka	86.43	51.25	137.68	27.89	109.79	79.74
14	Kerela	78.64	54.26	132.9	70.93	61.97	46.63
15	Madhya Pradesh	301.9	0	301.9	118.6	183.3	60.72
16	Maharashtra	73.17	205.34	278.51	70.38	208.13	74.73
17	Manipur	15.33	21.37	36.7	0.5	36.2	98.64
18	Meghalaya	6.97	17.35	24.32	5.84	18.48	75.99
19	Mizoram	9.04	32.38	41.42	11.85	29.57	71.39
20	Nagaland	0.37	40.29	40.66	0.76	39.9	98.13
21	Orissa	161.28	28.09	189.37	63.43	125.94	66.50
22	Punjab	34.92	41.06	75.98	45.97	30.01	39.50
23	Rajasthan	38.82	89.51	128.33	49.38	78.95	61.52
24	Sikkim	3.35	19.24	22.59	2.06	20.53	90.88
25	Tamil Nadu	49.87	145.83	195.7	85.96	109.74	56.08
26	Tripura	13.39	6.83	20.22	9.14	11.08	54.80
27	Uttar Pradesh	198.05	317.16	515.21	169.52	345.69	67.1 0
28	Uttaranchal	48.48	29.76	78.24	29.32	48.92	62.53
29	West Bengal	41.71	192.4	234.11	90.1	144.01	61.51
30	A and N Islands	14.25	0	14.25	11.72	2.53	17.75
31	Chandigarh	3.83	3	6.83	1.82	5.01	73.35
32	D and N Haveli	4.47	2.75	7.22	0.59	6.63	91.83
33	Daman and Diu	5.1	0	5.1	2.27	2.83	55.49
34	Delhi	16.8	44.81	61.61	12.96	48.65	78.96
35	Lakshadweep	9.42	0	9.42	9.1	0.32	3.40
36	Pondicherry	2.77	7.24	10.01	0.86	9.15	91.41
	TOTAL:	1776.86	2000.02	3776.88	1421.46	2355.42	62.36

Increasing of retirement age

1431. SHRI VED PRAKASH P. GOYAL: Will the Minister of HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE be pleased to state:

(a) the details of the present status of the proposal of increasing the retirement age of sub-cadre of general duty medical officers of the Central Health Services;

(b) whether it is a fact that retirement age of only three sub-cadres out of four of Central Health Services has been increased and if so, the reasons therefor;

(c) whether it is also a fact that the cabinet has turned down the proposal of increasing the retirement age of the general duty medical officers; and

(d) if so, the reasons therefor?